

Appl. No. 10/707,802
Amdt. dated July 25, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 05, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Rejection of claims 1-6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 1-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ono (2001/0022650).

5

Response:

Claims 1-9 have been cancelled, and are no longer in need of consideration. In their place, new claims 10-14 are presented, as explained below.

10 2. Amendments to the specification:

Paragraphs 0005, 0020, 0022, and 0023 of the specification have been amended to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added through these amendments, and acceptance of the amended specification is respectfully requested.

15 3. Introduction to new claims 10-16:

20 New claim 10 specifies that a spacer separates a ventilation chamber from a rear chamber of the TV. The spacer has a fan disposed in it for drawing air out of the rear chamber. The housing of the ventilation chamber contains an outlet for allowing air to be drawn into the ventilation chamber from the rear chamber to leave the TV through the outlet.

25 On the other hand, Ono does not teach a ventilation chamber separated from a casing with a spacer, in which a fan is disposed in the spacer, and in which an optical engine is disposed in the rear chamber. Moreover, Ono does not teach that the ventilation chamber contains an outlet for allowing air from the rear chamber to be blown out of the TV via the ventilation chamber.

Appl. No. 10/707,802
Amdt. dated July 25, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 05, 2005

5 Claims 11 and 12 recite that a conduit is connected between the fan and the outlet, and that the conduit is bent for preventing light from leaving the TV through the conduit. Ono also does not teach this limitation since Ono does not teach that the conduit is disposed in a ventilation chamber and the rear chamber contains the optical engine with a light source.

10 Claims 15 and 16 recite that a fence is disposed at the outlet, and that the fence's blades decline downwards. Ono also does not teach this limitation. The Examiner has stated that item 79 shown in Ono's Fig.8 is a fence equivalent to the applicant's fence. However, Ono's item 79 is an air throttle portion 79 for controlling the speed of air flow through the exhaust duct 48. Ono does not teach a fence formed in an outlet that is formed in the housing of the ventilation chamber, and also does not teach that the blades of the fence decline downward.

15 For these reasons, the applicant submits that new claims 10-16 are patentably distinct from the cited prior art. All of the limitations in claims 10-16 are fully supported by the specification and the figures, and no new matter has been added. Acceptance of new claims 10-16 is respectfully requested.

20 In view of the above arguments in favor of patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

25

Appl. No. 10/707,802
Amdt. dated July 25, 2005
Reply to Office action of May 05, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Date: July 25, 2005

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.